

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests substantive examination of the application in view of the following remarks.

In response to the allegation that the claims of this application constitute more than "a single general inventive concept" under PCT rule 13.1 because they lack the same or corresponding special technical features under PCT rule 13.2 (see MPEP 1850), and the requirement under 37 CFR 1.499, that applicant elect a single invention to which prosecution will be restricted, applicant hereby elects the invention of group I described in the office action as consisting of claims 1-5 and 7-17. Applicant traverses the requirement because it would not be an unreasonably serious burden on the examiner to search for all of the groups of claims of this restriction requirement.

The examiner claims that it would be a serious burden to search and examine all the claims because, for example, "the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification". The examiner's argument is a non-squintor because even if there are different areas of art, that does not establish that there is a serious burden in searching and examining all the groups. The fact is, that the invention of claim 6 is very closely related to the invention of claim 1, so that prior art that is material to claim 1 is likely to be material to claim 6 and vice versa. There is no legal reason that the examiner should insist on restriction.

The elected claims are in condition for allowance and applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the claims.

Please charge any fee deficiencies and credit any overpayments  
to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael E. Belk/  
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357  
Senior Attorney  
(914) 333-9643